

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

WILLIAM MOREHOUSE,

*Defendant.*

---

Crim. No. 07-604 (KSH)

**OPINION & ORDER**

**Katharine S. Hayden, U.S.D.J.**

On July 27, 2007 William Morehouse pleaded guilty to possessing child pornography in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(5)(B). He was sentenced on January 10, 2008, and his conviction was affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit on March 31, 2009.

Morehouse has sent a *pro se* letter request asking that the Court “advise [him] the arresting authority for the actions taken by Jill Lasseter,” who he claims was the “arresting officer” in his case. [D.E. 29.]

This Court is without jurisdiction to address Morehouse’s letter request, which is not framed as a cognizable claim for relief and asks only that the Court provide him information about an arrest that occurred over five years ago. The information Morehouse seeks is readily available to him. In affirming his conviction, the Third Circuit described the circumstances leading to Morehouse’s arrest:



In 2006, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“I.C.E.”) agents, as part of “Operation Predator,” focused on an internet site that offered subscribers access to child pornography. I.C.E. agents identified Morehouse as a subscriber, searched the hard drive of his computer and found more than 250 images of child pornography. Morehouse was charged and agreed to plead guilty to a violation of § 2252A(a)(5)(B).

[D.E. 26.]

While the Court need not address the merits of what appears to be a challenge to Agent Lasseter’s actions, the government provides the legal basis for Agent Lasseter’s arresting authority in its response to Morehouse’s *pro se* letter:

Jill Lasseter, a federal agent with I.C.E., assisted in the arrest of the defendant. As such, authority to execute the arrest existed not only as Special Agent Lasseter was a federal agent assisting with an arrest in connection with a federal crime but also pursuant to Title 19, United States Code Section 1589a as well as Title 8, United States Code, Section 1357.

[D.E. 30.]

Good cause appearing,

IT IS on this 2nd day of May, 2012,

**ORDERED** that Morehouse’s request for information [D.E. 29] is **DENIED**.

/s/ Katharine S. Hayden  
Katharine S. Hayden, U.S.D.J.